

# THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND ITS PRINCIPLES.

## S P E E C H

OF

HON. JAMES T. HALE, OF PENN.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, May 3, 1860.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. HALE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Republican party has been more misrepresented than any one that ever existed, in this country or any other. I propose to say a few words in regard to what I understand to be the principles of that party, to see whether they hold any doctrines that are inconsistent with the rights of any portion of the country—any doctrines not held by the fathers of the Republic, from the beginning down to the last very few years.

The doctrines of the Republican party, as I understand them, Mr. Chairman, are, opposition to the extension of human slavery, and protection to American industry. These I believe to be the two cardinal principles of that party. This is the only one we hold on the subject of slavery, except those other incidental measures that grow out of the opposition to its extension. We are opposed to taking \$200,000,000 from the people for the purchase of Cuba, to the acquisition of territory from Mexico, for the extension of the area of human bondage, and to the reopening of the African slave trade.

Have not these principles been held at all times, by all parties of the country, up almost to 1854? The North, with one voice, did so. They were also held by the founders of this Republic—not alone by those who belonged to the free States, but by those who belonged to the slave States; by the slaveholders of the country—patriotic men, who knew and admitted slavery to be an evil, which they were willing to do and did all in their power to prevent extending, and expected and hoped finally to accomplish its overthrow. We hold no other principles on that subject than they held. We stand just where they did—where Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Clay, Pinckney, and other slaveholding fathers and founders of the Re-

public, stood. Is not this true? The history of the country shows that, beyond any sort of doubt.

Who were the founders of the Missouri compromise line in 1820—that great and beneficent act of patriotism? Were they the fanatics of the North? No, sir; they were slaveholders of the South, with Henry Clay at their head. This measure, which gave peace and repose to the country, never was attempted to be disturbed, either by the North or by the South. On the contrary, up to 1854, the South, in good faith, regarded that compromise as one to be observed and kept by them. It is a remarkable fact, Mr. Chairman, that our Southern brethren never understood that they were so degraded and cheated by that measure, as they now say they were, and never regarded it as a badge of inferiority, as they now claim it to have been. It remained, sir, for a Yankee to discover that the South had been so wronged and cheated and insulted by that compromise measure of 1820. A gentleman from the green hills of Vermont goes to Illinois, studies law, comes back to Congress in due time—as he had a right to do—and instructs our Southern brethren as to their rights and duties, informing them that they have been most egregiously wronged by that act of 1820; that the men who framed and established it did not know what they were about—did not know that they were degrading the honor and sacrificing the rights of the South. It seems to me that this is an imputation on the patriotism and wisdom of the men of the South who framed that compromise measure, who sustained it, who were willing to abide by it for all time to come, and who did stand by it for so many years. Mr. Clay, that illustrious man, who was for a long time a favorite of the slaveholders of the South for the Presidency, always sustained it. Do you think that, if he had been living, it would have been repealed? Never. If Mr. Clay had been in the Senate in 1854, in my judgment,

the South never would and never could have repealed that bill. Like Rhoderic Dhu—

"One blast upon his bugle-horn  
Were worth a thousand men."

I should be perfectly willing, and I believe the Republican party would be, if it was possible, to have that line restored. It would be an end of this slavery agitation forever. Our Southern brethren tell us not to agitate this question. I, for one, have no desire to do so. I came here with no such purpose. The slavery question was thrust into our faces without any reason, in the most offensive manner; and when we repel the charges against us, we are told not to agitate the slavery question. I should be willing to have it banished forever from these Halls, and to never have the subject alluded to. But when we hear the subject constantly iterated and reiterated by the South, how can we help speaking? We have no design or desire to interfere with slavery in the States where it now exists. We have said so in every way in which a political party can speak—in our platforms, resolutions, and speeches. We have declared that we would protect the rights of the South under the Constitution, and we mean to do it; but, sir, it is our duty and our intention to maintain inviolate our own rights under the Constitution, as well as theirs.

The views we hold in regard to the extension of slavery are those which were held by all the people of the free States but a few years since. The Legislature of my own State declared, in 1847, that no territory should be received from Mexico, unless it was provided, as the fundamental condition of the acquisition, that slavery should be forever excluded from its limits. That was the doctrine of the Democratic party before the Republican party had an existence. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I ask the Clerk to read the resolutions of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

The Clerk read, as follows:

"Whereas the existing war with Mexico may result in the acquisition of new territory to the Union; and whereas measures are now pending in Congress, having in view the appropriation of money and the conferring of authority upon the treaty-making power to this end: Therefore,

"Resolved by the Senate, &c., That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to vote against any measure whatever by which territory will accrue to the Union, unless, as a part of the fundamental law upon which any compact or treaty for this purpose is based, slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be forever prohibited.

"Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward a copy of the foregoing to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Mr. HALE. The Committee will perceive that that resolution requests the Senators and

Representatives of Pennsylvania to vote against the acquisition of any territory, unless slavery shall be excluded from it. It was voted for by every Democratic member of the lower House of the Legislature, and by all the Senators but three—Mr. BIGLER, the present Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, being in the Senate, and voting for it. If resolutions like that were now adopted by any party in Pennsylvania, they would be denounced by the Democratic leaders as treasonable, incendiary, and dangerous to the peace and welfare of the Union. A simple resolution, which was offered at this session, instructing the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting slavery where we have the constitutional right to do so, was considered a dangerous attack upon the rights of the South. They tell us now, that if we assert that freedom is the proper condition of the Territories, and that slavery does not exist and must not go there; and if we should dare to elect a President holding these views, that he shall never take his seat, and that the union shall be dissolved in consequence. Can it be that this course on the part of the South has caused this great change in the politicians of the North? Have we been frightened from our propriety and our rights by impotent and insolent threats? It seems to me that no other reason for the change can be ascribed. If this be so, if men will be deterred from holding their opinions by such reasons, then I think slavery of the baser sort may fairly be said to exist north of Mason and Dixon's line.

How would our Southern brethren feel, if we put a like proposition to them? We believe slavery to be wrong. We think that it is an evil. You, gentlemen, believe that slavery is right, and ought to go into the Territories. You favor the extension of slavery. Suppose we should say that if you elected a man to the office of President, who held the same views you do, and elected him in a peaceful and constitutional manner, we would never allow him to be sworn into office, but would, in that event, dissolve this Union, and destroy the Government, would it not be fairly said that such a threat deserved only your scorn and contempt? Surely it would. So we treat it when it comes from you. No such threat will, I think, prevent the men of the North from exercising the sacred right of suffrage in the way they think proper. We intend, at the next election, to elect a Republican President—if we can get votes enough; and when he is elected, he will take his seat. Of that you may be sure.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party is a Union party. It is in favor of preserving this Union in its integrity, and with all the rights of all the sections. We do not desire the preservation of the Union, as our Southern friends sometimes allege, for mercenary purposes. We disclaim that entirely. We have higher and nobler reasons for sustaining it. We would



preserve it because it is a rich legacy from our forefathers, won by their toil and blood. We have received it unimpaired, and unimpaired we intend to leave it to our children. We believe it to be the best form of government on earth, and that its destruction would be the greatest political calamity that could befall us, and one that must be averted by almost any conceivable sacrifice.

My own State has suffered more from the acts of the South, within the last fifteen years, than all the Southern States together have suffered from the acts of the North from the beginning of the Government. We have seen our interests struck down by the free-trade Democrats of the South, in the repeal of the tariff of 1842; our property depreciated in value; our manufactories closed; our business in a great manner ruined; and yet we have not threatened to dissolve the Union on that account. We did not claim the right to redress our grievances in that way. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that we have lost more property by the repeal of the tariff of 1842 than you have by all the runaway slaves, from the foundation of the Government down to the present time.

Mr. Chairman, what have we done with respect to slavery, that should bring upon us all this fearful storm? What principles do we now hold, that should so excite their hostility? I live in a State bordering some three or four hundred miles upon slave territory; and yet the fugitive slave law, odious as it is to the mass of our people, is executed there without serious difficulty. To be sure, we require Southern men to come after their slaves; we do not propose to run down their negroes and take them back. They should not ask that; but when they come to us and ask for their rights, their request is always respected, although it is opposed to the feelings of all our people. We were brought up to look upon slavery as a great moral, social, and political evil; as a wrong in itself; and yet, as it is in the bond, we abide by it. We entered into this Union with States, knowing that they held slaves; and we feel ourselves bound to sustain that institution so far as the law and the Constitution require us to do so, but no further.

Does the South respect our rights as much as we do theirs? Why, sir, a free man cannot go into a slave State and speak what George Washington and Thomas Jefferson taught, without being considered an abolitionist, an incendiary, a dangerous man; taken and punished in the most shameful manner, and sent out of the country; and he may think himself well off if he escapes with his life. They break open the mails, and destroy what they please of the contents; and, more than that, we are told that we must not exercise the right of suffrage in the manner we think proper. When we are ready to give up all these rights, we shall be fit for slavery, but not before.

I propose to devote some remarks now to the discussion of that other principle of the Republican party—protection to American industry. Upon that subject I cannot expect to say anything very new or interesting; anything which has not been said by others better qualified to discuss it than I am. The best minds of this country have been turned to its examination; and I think I may safely say that, when they have done so with an impartial desire to arrive at the truth, the decision has almost universally been in favor of the doctrine.

Before I proceed to the discussion of that subject, I wish to notice some remarks by the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MILLSON,] who addressed the Committee a day or two since. I did not hear the gentleman's speech, but I see it reported in the Globe; and in order that he may not be misrepresented, I will read what he said on that occasion:

"But I understood the allusion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and it confirms me in the supposition that I have indulged for some time past as to the objects of the Republican party, with which the gentleman is avowedly associated. What is that party? Sir, I say, for one, that I do not fear the Republican party in any of its assaults upon slavery. I am not sensitive; because I do not fear you, gentlemen. You can do nothing that I dread. You will do nothing that can alarm me."

The gentleman said only what he believes, and what every other gentleman on that side of the House believes, if he would speak his true sentiments. The Republican party have no desire, have no design, have no power, have no wish, to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists. They have said so in every form, on every occasion, and gentlemen ought to believe us; and I am glad to find the gentleman from Virginia does. He says further:

"And yet you maintain your organization, hoping that the strong anti-slavery sentiment which you attempt to nourish and perpetuate will induce the people to remain with you, bound together as a Republican party; and when you are lifted into power, then you will give that protection to Northern manufacturing and mining interests, and prosecute those grand and gaudy schemes of internal improvement, that you have been prevented for so many years from accomplishing, by the stern opposition of the Democratic party."

I am obliged to the gentleman from Virginia for that candid and frank avowal of what he believes to be the position and objects of the Republican party. That is, no doubt, the true secret of the opposition to that party on the part of our Democratic friends. They do not fear us on the slavery question. They themselves say so, speaking through one of their most distinguished leaders on this floor; but they oppose us because they believe that, when we do get into power, we will pass laws for the

protection of Northern industry. That is the true secret of their opposition. They are not afraid of us on account of slavery; and why should they be? Do we not hold the same principles on that subject that Henry Clay held in his lifetime? We stand precisely where he stood when he was supported by a large majority of the slaveholders of the South for the Presidency. I ask leave to read what Mr. Clay says on that subject:

"So long as God allows the vital current to flow through my veins; so long as reason holds her seat enthroned in my brain, I will never, never, aid in submitting one rood of free territory to the everlasting curse of human bondage."

Does the Republican party hold any stronger position than this? No, sir. What does he say again with regard to the moral, political, and social aspect of slavery?

"I have made no change from the earliest moment when I could consider the institution of slavery. I have held and I have said, from that day down to the present, again and again, and I shall go down to the grave with the opinion, that it is an evil—a social and political evil—and that it is a wrong as it respects those who are subject to the institution of slavery. These are my opinions."—*Speech on the Compromise of 1850.*

Now, these are the opinions of the Republican party, and as far as any member of that party has gone. Then why do they complain of us? They know well that, so far as slavery in the States is concerned, they have nothing to fear from us; and as to the Territories, it would be a vain and useless effort for slavery to undertake to keep up with the activity and energy of freedom there. They have tried that once, in endeavoring to make Kansas a slave State. That lesson, I trust, will not soon be forgotten by them; and I also think the effort will not soon be repeated.

Give us, Mr. Chairman, the homestead bill, as I trust we will soon have it. Give us a fair and free election by the people of the Territories, and freedom, I think, would have nothing to fear from the result. The Territories are now free. They will be free. It is their right and their destiny. Why should our Southern friends endeavor to force slavery on them? They have ample space within their own States for all conceivable wants of the system. According to the admission of a distinguished Senator from the South, made in the Senate a short time since, they have territory sufficient for two hundred million slaves within the slave States. As they have now but four million, they will scarcely need any more slave territory for the next five hundred years at least.

The gentleman from Virginia, however, informs us that the Republican party are in favor of the protection of American industry, which doctrine, he says, has been successfully opposed by the Democratic party. This, although

persistently denied by that party in my State, is unquestionably true, and I am glad to have so veritable a witness of the fact in the gentleman himself.

Mr. MILLSON. I rather think the gentleman misapprehends what I said the day before yesterday.

Mr. HALE. I read from the report in the *Globe*.

Mr. MILLSON. I speak of the gentleman's interpretation. The gentleman is in error in supposing that I did not complain of the position of the Republican party. What I said was this: that, while the real object of the Republican party was to revive the Federal policy of the country, their pretended object was only to legislate for the prohibition of slavery in the Territories. I did not mean to be understood as declaring that the Southern members had no right to complain of the position of the Republican party. On the contrary, I maintained that, in keeping up this agitation—which I endeavored to show they did not themselves hope to be productive of any legislative result—they were doing serious mischief to the South. I said I did not fear their legislation, because they had not the legislative capacity to do what they aimed at doing. They say that they desire to prohibit slavery in the Territories; but I remarked that their real object was to establish the doctrine of the Federal party. I meant to say that, while their pretenses were offensive to the South, their measures would not be dangerous to the South. Their real objects, though not offensive to the South, are, in their practical effect, dangerous to the South; and, while the gentleman himself avows that he, as a member of the Republican party, desires the re-establishment of the protective policy, yet I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I adverted to the other day, that nowhere can he find a published resolution of his party in avowal of any such object.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to misinterpret the gentleman from Virginia. I am perfectly willing to insert in my speech any portion of his that he may desire. What I read I think clearly embraced his idea, that he did not fear what the Republican party would do, so far as slavery is concerned, but that the real object of the party, and what was, in the main, the ground of objection to it, was, that it aimed to restore the protective system. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican party is fully committed to the great doctrine of protection to American industry. I am sure that I would not belong to any party that was not. No party in my State could exist, did it not at least profess to hold that doctrine. The Democratic party there claims to do so, with how much good faith I leave to the gentleman from Virginia to answer.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia is greatly mistaken if he supposes that the protective system is sustained upon the popularity



of anti-slavery notions. There is no doubt a deep feeling in the Northern States against the extension of slavery; but, so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, the feeling in favor of the protection of American industry is quite as strong, and it would be as firmly implanted in the public mind there if the other question had no existence. We believe both doctrines to be just and true. If one receives aid from the other, has the gentleman any right to complain? Certainly not. Every member of the Republican party in this House, save one, has voted to sustain that measure; and it may, therefore, be fairly claimed, I think, that protection to American industry is one of the principles of that party.

The condition of the country at this time demands the earnest and thoughtful consideration of all those intrusted with the management of its affairs; and it seems to me that we should at least occasionally turn our thoughts to the actual results and inevitable tendency of the present practical free-trade policy which now and for some time past has ruled this country, even if we thereby, for the time, suffered the "Dred Scott" decision and its kindred topics to be passed over. Our Democratic friends seem to think there are no other interests worthy of our attention, and scarcely deserving a passing notice, but the single one of slavery. It engrosses the legislation of the country, to the exclusion of almost everything else. All other questions, all other interests, have to give way before its imperious demands and exacting and aggressive spirit.

But I desire to make no further remarks upon this subject at present. My purpose is to call attention to the present disordered state of our financial affairs; and, if possible, to devise a remedy. We now owe a foreign debt of over five hundred million dollars, and that debt is steadily increasing more than fifty million annually, while our ability to pay is constantly decreasing. Our imports are every year growing larger; and our exports, except from accidental and extraordinary causes, are falling off. Our manufactories are, one by one, going down under the destructive effects of foreign competition; our country drained of its precious metals, to make up the balance of trade, always against us; the industry and enterprise of the country everywhere, to a great extent, prostrate and paralyzed, under the depressing effect which this state of things is sure, sooner or later, to bring in its train. Nothing can be more certain—cause and effect are not more sure, and no axiom in political economy can be truer—than that a nation that constantly buys more than it sells, will, in time, become bankrupt. A variety of causes may postpone the evil day; temporary relief may occasionally be found; but the certain tendency of this course is, and must be, to this end. This state of affairs existed prior to the passage of the tariff of 1842, when, in the progress of the

free-trade system, for some years previous to that time, we were brought to the verge of bankruptcy; and a bankrupt law, which at one stroke wiped out our indebtedness of untold millions, became, as was supposed, a necessity. The tariff of 1842 gradually brought the country out of the depression in which it had been thrown by the previous system, and restored it to unwonted prosperity; and it may safely be asserted, that every branch of industry and enterprise in this country never was more prosperous than between the years 1843 and 1847—the time when the beneficial effects of the tariff of 1842 had their legitimate influences.

We seek, by the passage of the present tariff bill, to arrest this downward progress of the country, and restore it to that state of prosperity and real independence, which our great natural wealth and resources, and the industry, skill, and enterprise of our people justly entitle us to. To do this, we must, in laying our revenue laws, so protect and encourage our own industry, that we shall be able to carry the productions of this country to the point of actual use. This would increase the capacity of the consumers of agricultural products. Our farmers would have a market at their doors for their surplus productions; and the consumers would, from their increased ability and numbers, buy more of all kinds of farming productions; and nothing would stimulate the agricultural interests of the country so much as a ready market near his own door of every agricultural production which the farmer could raise.

How much is lost now for the want of a home market for many of the bulky articles of the farm which will not bear a long transportation; how much is lost in transporting the more valuable products to a distant and expensive market, it is easy to imagine.

We have facilities for manufacturing, in all natural resources, quite equal, if not superior, to any other country in the world; in water power, soil, climate, and mineral wealth; in the intelligence, skill, and industry of our workmen, and in that active spirit of enterprise which characterizes the American people above all others. Then, why is it that, with these superior advantages, our own manufactures so languish? Why is it that we send our raw material to a foreign country, to be there manufactured, and returned to us in its finished state, and also send our breadstuffs to the same distant market, to feed those engaged in the same manufacture, and paying the large amount required for the transportation of the raw materials and agricultural products to a foreign land, and then paying for the same returned to us in the shape of the finished article?

It is principally to the difference in the price of labor between this country and Europe that we are to look for the difficulty in our manufactures competing with foreign countries, especially in those articles, such as iron, where manual

labor enters largely into their production. An article that can be made principally by machinery needs but little if any protection; but it is not so with those that require a large amount of labor; and it then becomes a question of vital importance, and one that must be fairly met, whether it is the true policy of this Government to adopt that system which tends to depress labor down to the level of the European standard, or that other and better one, which shall increase its value, and elevate its importance to its just rank as the great element of our national wealth and prosperity.

The argument in favor of protection, based upon the advantages it confers and the benefits it affords to the free labor of the country, is, in my opinion, amply sufficient, if no other existed.

A just division of labor must be admitted, I think, an essential requisite, in order to advance the wealth and prosperity of a nation to its highest attainable point. It will not do to have all, or an undue proportion, engaged in agriculture, lest there be found no market for the farming surplus; nor will it do for all to be engaged in manufactures, lest there should be no agricultural products for their subsistence. The true condition of a State, and the most prosperous, is when there is a constant and profitable employment for the artisan, and a convenient and reliable market for the farmer. Every intelligent community would soon adjust its business so as to bring about this result, if there were no disturbing causes outside which rendered it impracticable. The lower price of labor in foreign lands than in our own is the great disturbing cause which prevents this from being effected here; and to remove this difficulty is one principal object of the protective system.

Suppose we are required to pay a larger price for a manufactured article made at home than for the same made in Europe. This may be conceded for the sake of the argument; although I am confident that where an article can be produced and manufactured in this country, all experience proves that when sufficiently protected, for a reasonable time, the superior skill of our workmen, and the active spirit of competition among our people, have almost invariably reduced the price below what it was when the manufacture of it was first commenced.

But suppose, as I said, the article costs more made here than we could import it for; in the first place, we must have the money which we raise by duties on foreign goods for the support of the Government—and, by general consent, this is the easiest and best mode of raising revenue; so that in reality, so long as a tariff raises only sufficient for the wants of the Government, nothing whatever is paid as a bounty to the manufacturer. We only ask, that when the money required by the Government is to be raised, a discrimination shall be made, so as to afford a reasonable protection to the great interests of the country. Nothing can be more

unreasonable and unjust than to refuse this. To do so would seem to be a policy dictated by the narrowest spirit of partisanship, far removed from a true patriotism and a wise statesmanship. If, while raising the necessary money for the support of the Government, we can at the same time so impose the duty as to foster the manufactures of the country, develop the mineral wealth, encourage and protect labor, give a good home market to the farmer, and thereby give an active and steady impulse to the whole business of the country, why shall we not do so? Can any good reason be shown for pursuing the opposite policy? Surely if gentlemen would divest themselves of prejudice and party feeling, and come to the examination of the question with an impartial spirit, there could be no doubt of the result.

We do not desire a tariff so high as to be prohibitory, for then no revenue could be raised under it. Nor should it be indiscriminate, for then it would afford no sufficient protection.

The present tariff bill is believed to be adjusted, as nearly as possible, upon the principle of raising sufficient revenue for the just wants of the Government, and at the same time so discriminating as to afford a reasonable amount of protection to American industry.

This policy, so eminently wise and just, has so commended itself to the people of the State I in part represent, that all parties there claim to be its friends and supporters. Especially does the so-called Democratic party claim to be its peculiar champion just before an important election, when it is necessary to secure the votes of its friends. It will sound strange to honorable gentlemen on the other side of this House, to be told that they belong to the protective-tariff party of the country, and that they are so represented in the tariff States, when it is well known here that, with scarcely an exception, you and the party to which you belong are opposed to the whole system.

It is, however, very possible that a candidate may be nominated by that party who will be represented to the people of Pennsylvania as a good tariff man, hoping thereby, as in times past, to secure the support of the confiding people of my State. The great swindle of 1844, I trust, however, has not been forgotten by them.

It may be, the same game will succeed again. That it will be tried, there is not much doubt. We shall see whether our people will consent to be again deceived and betrayed. We may safely say, from all past history, that the extent of the friendship of our Democratic leaders for a tariff amounts to resolutions in town meetings and conventions, and perhaps stump speeches occasionally, before an election; and no more. So it will always be. The policy of that party is controlled, and in all future time is likely to be controlled, by that portion of it living in the cotton States of the South, who are foolishly hostile to the free labor of the



North—erroneously, I think—believing their interest is to send their raw material to Europe, and bring back from there the manufactured article, instead of encouraging those of our own country.

From the nature of the labor in that region, it must be confined to its rudest and simplest form; being ignorant and unpaid, it has no motive, even if it had the capacity, to rise above its lowest level. The North, on the contrary, by the just respect everywhere paid to honest toil, and the skill, enterprise, and intelligence of its laboring citizens, who constitute the great bulk as well as the chief support of its society, has attained the highest point of excellence in all its industrial pursuits, and stands this day at the head of the civilized world in its triumphs of labor directed by skill and science.

How is our country to become permanently prosperous, when subjected to the constant drain upon it, arising from the large excess of our imports over our exports? What nation or individual could hope to succeed, in the long run, who constantly bought more than his income justified, and was consequently every year going more and more in debt?

As an example of the increasing progress of our foreign debt, already immense, take the imports and exports at the port of New York alone for the month of March last, viz: Imports, \$22,188,150; exports, (exclusive of specie,) \$8,128,759; difference, \$14,059,39:

*Imports at New York for March.*

	1858.	1859.	1860.
Dutiable merchandise..	\$7,845,526	\$15,314,028	\$16,166,098
Free merchandise.....	3,394,763	2,620,354	3,739,241
Specie and bullion.....	277,206	81,366	85,096
Withdrawn from warehouse.....	4,444,415	1,718,237	2,200,117
Total.....	14,561,987	19,733,980	22,188,150
Warehoused.....	1,812,230	2,504,413	3,582,093
Cash duties.....		3,164,011	3,477,545

*Exports at New York for March.*

	1858.	1859.	1860.
Domestic merchandise..	\$4,503,371	\$5,377,840	\$6,998,687
Foreign merchandise....	677,489	498,161	1,130,067
Specie and bullion.....	836,194	3,343,677	2,381,663
Total.....	6,017,054	9,219,678	10,510,417

This, for the single month of March, will show the tendency of our present system to keep us constantly in debt, and transfer our manufacturing establishments to Great Britain, France, and Germany.

In the article of iron, in which the country at large is so deeply interested as an article of prime necessity both in peace and war, and which we could produce in any quantity sufficient to supply the world, the policy of the Democratic free-trade party is to permit the ore to remain undisturbed in its native beds in our own country, and to import it from England by millions annually; depriving us thereby not only of the large amount of cash which is withdrawn to pay for it abroad, but the great advantages that would accrue from its manufacture here to the farmer and laborer, as well as to every branch of industry.

*Table showing the Imports and Custom-house value of Iron and manufactures of Iron and Steel, under the Tariff of 1846, for ten years and nine months.*

Description of iron imported.	Total tons.	Total value.
Pig-iron.....	893,990	\$18,941,661
Sheet iron.....	139,966	8,749,775
Hoop iron.....	52,962	2,601,621
Nail, spike, and brazier rods..	48,044	1,964,275
Brazier rods.....	—	288,353
Band and scroll iron.....	3,678	216,105
Old and scrap iron.....	108,142	1,732,993
Railroad bars.....	1,732,456	60,095,271
Bar iron by rolling.....	838,195	38,994,605
Bars, otherwise, and rolling...	146,074	6,002,556
Manufactures of iron and steel.	124,968	74,980,591
Cast, shear, and German steel.	82,460	15,700,153
Other kinds steel.....	30,832	5,294,913
Total.....	4,207,059	220,561,372
Average tons per year.....	400,000	\$23,000,000

From which it will be seen that the amount of iron imported into the country for ten years and seven months, under the tariff of 1846, was equal to 4,207,000 tons, costing \$230,561,000; or over 400,000 tons annually, and over \$23,000,000 every year. As our other imports, independent of iron, greatly exceeded all our exports, it may be fairly claimed that every dollar of this vast sum had to be paid in gold and silver. What a depressing effect this would have upon the manufacture of iron in this country, and how much benefit the distribution of this sum, or even one-half of it, would have conferred upon the business of the country, it is not necessary to state. Every man of ordinary intelligence must at once see and acknowledge it.

The time has passed when it was alleged, and to some extent believed, that the interest of the manufacturer and farmer was opposed to each other. No fact in political economy can be more surely demonstrated, than the entire harmony of all the great industrial interests of the country. When the manufacturers are prosperous, and labor has constant demand and fair wages, the farmer finds a ready and profitable market. So, on the contrary, when manufactures languish, and an undue proportion of the labor of the country is withdrawn from them, and either not profitably engaged or not engaged at all, the farmer fails to find his accustomed home market, and every department of enterprise and business languishes.

The true mode of laying a tariff upon all articles of luxury is as high a duty as they will bear without excluding their importation. On all those articles which cannot be produced here, and are needed by our manufacturers, and on all articles of necessity, used by the poorer classes as well as the rich, which are not the production of this country, there should be no duty whatever. This is the principle which governs the bill reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, and must commend itself, by its justice and propriety, to all who

desire to promote the prosperity of the country, and the interests of all classes of our citizens, without increasing their burdens.

Specific duties, when the article is of uniform value, or nearly so, are to be preferred, for their simplicity and their freedom from temptation to frauds, even as a revenue measure. As a protective principle, they are indispensable to that uniformity and stability so essential to make it of real value. As an illustration, take the article of iron. I have before me the prices current of iron in Liverpool, for a number of years, under the tariff of 1846. In 1850, the average price of bar iron in Liverpool was £5 10s.; in 1851, it was £10 10s.—within a trifle of one hundred per cent. difference in one year; in 1852, it was £5 7s. 6d.; in 1853, £9; in 1854, £10, &c.—the duty, of course, varying with the price of the article, increasing as the price increased, and decreasing as the price fell. It is manifest that this kind of duty can afford no protection. If the principle was changed, and the duty increased as the price fell, so as to keep the value uniform, it would be much nearer the true mode, and might be regarded as, to some extent, a measure of protection, as well as one of revenue.

A departure from specific duties is only justifiable when the article so varies in price as to render them unjust or impossible. This bill is framed upon that principle, and so combines the two as to make it liable to no objection on that account.

The duty on iron, which is one I have examined with some care, does not vary essentially from that of 1846. The average duty on railroad iron, under that tariff, was \$10.40 per ton;

and on bar iron, by rolling, \$13.96; and on pig iron, \$4.65. So that the present duty is but little over one dollar per ton increase. But this is not a fair statement, so far as the price to the consumer is concerned. It is well known that the duty under that law is an *ad valorem* one on the invoice price in England. When delivered here, if the market does not justify its immediate sale, it is stored in Government warehouses, without any duty being paid until the price increases, or the wants of the owner requires him to sell; so that the actual price to the consumer, under this bill, will probably average but little, if any, more than under that, while the revenue to the Government will be increased.

As this bill proposes to abolish the warehouse system, and makes the duty payable within thirty days after its arrival here, it may fairly be argued that, while this bill will afford a fair protection to the manufacturer, by reason of its permanent and uniform rate, which can always be relied upon by him, it will not materially, if at all, increase the price to the consumer. Shall not a measure, then, which has so much to approve, and nothing to condemn; which is fraught with benefits and blessings to all classes of our people; which encourages labor, fosters legitimate enterprise, aids in developing our resources, strengthens and invigorates every branch of industry, adding so much to the wealth, happiness, and prosperity of our country, receive the favorable action of Congress, to which it is so justly entitled? I cannot doubt it. It is based upon justice and sound policy, and must triumph.